



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Ur Kasdîm.

BY PROF. FRANCIS BROWN.

RECENT discussions by Dillmann, Budde, Kittel and others have given a new phase to the question as to the early home of the Hebrews. An exhaustive treatment of this subject is not here proposed. The present paper merely offers a few remarks on some of the later critical inquiries concerning the location of Ur Kasdîm.¹

For more than thirty years the opinion has been gaining ground that Ur Kasdîm is to be identified with the ruins at El-Mukayyar on the west bank of the Lower Euphrates, where bricks stamped with the name *Uru* were found by Mr. Taylor.² There is abundant evidence that the city bearing this name was one of the most ancient and influential in Babylonia.³

The arguments for the identification have been, primarily, the name *Ur(u)* and the mention of *Chaldeans* (Χαλδαῖοι = כַּשְׁדִּים) as dwellers in Babylonia,⁴ and, besides these, the close relationship between the Hebrews and the Babylonio-Assyrians in language, in religious ideas, and in certain early literary products.⁵ It must at all

¹ אֹר כַּשְׁדִּים, Gen. xi. 28, 31; xv. 7; Neh. ix. 7†.

² H. RAWLINSON: *Babylonian Discoveries of Mr. Taylor*, Athenæum, Mar. 18, 1854, p. 341. J. E. TAYLOR: *Notes on the Ruins of Mugeyer*, J. R. A. S. xv. 1855, pp. 260-276. W. K. LOFTUS: *Travels and Researches in Chaldea and Susiana*, London, 1857, pp. 127 sqq.

³ Cf., e.g., C. P. TIELE: *Babylonisch-Assyrische Geschichte*, i., Gotha, 1886, pp. 81, 85.

⁴ In the cuneiform inscriptions not before the ninth century, B.C., it is true, unless Friedr. Delitzsch is right in his brilliant but doubtful theory, whereby *Kaššû* = *Kašdû* = כַּשְׁדִּים. Cf. FRIEDR. DELITZSCH: *Wo lag das Paradies?* 1881, pp. 55, 129; *Sprache der Kossäer*, Leipzig, 1884, p. 61.

⁵ See the fullest statements by E. SCHRADER: *Semitismus u. Babylonismus*, Jahrb. f. prot. Theol., 1875, pp. 117-133; cf. ID., *Abstammung der Chaldäer u. Ursitze der Semiten*, ZDMG., 1873 (xxvii.) pp. 397-424. Also: ID., *Die Keilinschriften u. die Geschichtsforschung*, Giessen, 1878, pp. 94-99. *Die Keilinschriften u. das Alte Testament*, Giessen, 1872, pp. 42-45, and 383 sq.: 2^{te} Aufl., Giessen, 1883, pp. 129-133; Eng. Trans., i., London, 1885, pp. 114-119; also, Art. *Ur*, in Riehm's *HdWB. d. Bibl. Alterth.* Cf. FRIEDR. DELITZSCH: *Wo lag das Paradies?* Leipzig, 1881, pp. 226 sq. In KAT¹, pp. 42 sqq., Schrader

events be said, that no other identification has been supported by anything like the same array of attractive reasons.

Nevertheless, serious objections have been offered to the validity of these reasons. Dillmann, who has always been skeptical on this matter, read an essay before the Berlin Academy,¹ to show that the supposed resemblances between the early chapters of Genesis and the Babylonian legends had been greatly exaggerated, and that these in fact afford no argument for a Babylonian origin of the Hebrew migration. His position is especially strong as against certain wild and hasty proposals to account for these resemblances by Babylonian influence in the time of the exile. So far forth he is a co-worker with those who account for them by early association of Hebrews and Babylonians in an Euphratic home. He parts company with these, however, before reaching this conclusion, and takes the ground that the conclusion cannot be held valid so long as, on the one hand, the resemblances between the Hebrew stories and those of other kindred peoples (*e.g.*, the creation legend of the Phœnicians) are not counter-balanced by more stringent reasons in favor of the Babylonian relationship, and, on the other, the possibility exists of closer resemblances still, in other quarters, which might be brought to light if literary monuments left, *e.g.*, by the Aramæans and the Hittites could be discovered and interpreted. The whole essay is a model of critical caution and severe argument. It is therefore very effective. Several considerations, however, may be brought forward, which at least modify the impression made by it: (1) at the most, it would result in the verdict, "Not proven." It would permit doubt, but not denial, of the Babylonian residence of the early Hebrews. For the long interval of time, the modifying effect of nomadic life, the influence of purer and profounder religious ideas would account for many changes in the form and contents of stories once held in common, even leaving out of account considerable variations in different Babylonian versions of these narratives.

(2) While it is unwarrantable to exaggerate the resemblances, as has undoubtedly been often done, it is obviously wrong to minimize them. After all deductions are made, there is still a most striking similarity between the Flood story in the Hebrew and in the Babylonian form of it. In regard to the "Creation Tablets" and Berossus'

maintained the Babylonian home of the Hebrews on the ground of the name כְּשָׁדִים alone.

¹ A. DILLMANN: *Ueber die Herkunft der urgeschichtlichen Sagen der Hebräer*. Sitzungsbericht d. Berl. Akad. d. Wiss., 1882, xxi., Apr. 27.

Creation story also, while fully recognizing the wide divergence between these and Gen. i., I am compelled to think that more weight should be given to the points of likeness than Dillmann allows, and that these are somewhat numerous and significant. It would be aside from the main purpose of this paper to examine them in detail.¹ I will merely remark that besides the material resemblance, the formal should be observed, — not merely the opening construction, with a relative temporal clause, in Gen. i. 1 and the cuneiform text alike, but also the movement. If we see in Gen i.–ii. 4^a a pentameter poem with strophical divisions,² it is at least worthy of note that the Creation Tablets, although a rigid metrical scheme in them cannot now be established, even in their mutilated condition show a five-toned line as the prevailing movement, and can be readily divided into strophes. Without dwelling on this, it is not out of place to remind ourselves that the story of the Tower of Babel, Gen. xi. 1–9 (with which Dillmann does not deal), although no counterpart to it has been found in the inscriptions, proves at least that to connect earlier generations of men with Babylonia was not an unfamiliar thought with the Hebrews. Cf., also, Gen. x. 8–12. But,

(3) the question is not of resting the Babylonian origin of the Hebrews upon these resemblances alone; they are called upon to do duty only as one proof among many. If they were less noticeable than they are, they might still have corroborative force, in combination with other arguments. As a matter of fact, we have to deal with resemblances in religious ideas, and in language, — including vocabulary, phonetic agreement, and structure, and especially with the Biblical assertion that Abram came from Ur Kasdîm. Much more thorough work is needed to determine, accurately and finally, the weight of all these arguments, but in the meantime if the identification Ur-Mukayyar be on other grounds raised to a high degree of probability, the literary resemblances will serve to confirm it.

This brings us back to the special object of the present inquiry, *viz.*, what attitude should be taken in view of recent discussions toward the identification of Ur Kasdîm?

There is a tendency now manifested among Old Testament critics, not Assyriologists, to admit the identification, but, on critical and exegetical grounds, to deny its historical validity.

¹ It is sufficient to refer to SCHRADER, KAT², Giessen, 1883, pp. 1 sqq. BUDDÉ: *Die Biblische Urgeschichte*, Giessen, 1883, pp. 473 sqq.

² C. A. BRIGGS: *The Hebrew Poem of the Creation*, Old Testament Student, April, 1884.

The great objection to it, as historic fact, is based on the difficulty of reconciling a Babylonian starting-point for the Hebrew migration with other geographical statements of the book of Genesis. Dillmann¹ has not ignored this point, but it has been most elaborately treated by Kittel.²

Of the three occurrences of *Ur Kasdîm* in Genesis (Neh. ix. 8 being practically equivalent to, and clearly dependent on, Gen. xv. 7) one falls in a verse ascribed by all analytical critics to P, viz., Gen. xi. 31. But attention is directed to the fact that Gen. xi. 10-22 (P; cf. Gen. x. 22, also P), apparently representing a migration from Armenia where the ark landed (Gen. viii. 4, P), give to descendants of Shem names, some of which are found attached, not to Babylonia, but to districts of Upper Mesopotamia, and regions north of it. In view of the supposed conflict of this series, pointing northward, with a Babylonian Ur, Dillmann proposes to regard *Ur Kasdîm*, in Gen. xi. 31, as an insertion from R. Against the proposal Kittel makes the objection, that some point of departure must, by the structure of the verse, have originally stood here, and that it is unwarrantable to suppose that R expunged such original name, and inserted in its place Ur Kasdîm. This objection appears to be well taken. We are not justified in denying Ur Kasdîm to P himself, by the apparent difficulty in which it involves us, when such a denial rests on the assumption that P actually wrote, where Ur. Kasdîm now stands, a name occasioning no difficulty. As far as the evidence goes it is in favor of Ur Kasdîm as originally written by P.

The other two occurrences of Ur Kasdîm are in Gen. xi. 28 and xv. 7. The former verse is agreed by Böhmer, Budde, Kittel, Dillmann⁵ to belong to J (see their arguments, especially Kittel, *Theol. Stud. a. Württ.*, Budde, p. 414 sqq.³).

Here, again, however, it is pointed out that there is lack of harmony with other statements of J, particularly those which represent the family of Abraham and of Isaac having their home in Upper Mesopotamia (Gen. xxiv. 3 sqq. 7, 10, 15, etc., — cf. xxii. 20 sqq.; xxvii. 43; xxviii. 10; xxix. 4 sq.), while there is no intimation anywhere that this had not always been their dwelling-place, and that of

¹ A. DILLMAN: *Die Genesis*, 3^{te} Aufl., Leipzig, 1875; 4^{te}, 1882; 5^{te}, 1886. See on Gen. xi. 28 sqq.

² R. KITTEL: *Die Herkunft der Hebräer nach dem Alten Testament*. Theol. Studien aus Württemberg, vii. (1886), 3. Also, *Geschichte der Hebräer*, i., Gotha, 1888, §§ 13, 14, 17.

³ Cf. also KAUTZSCH U. SOCIN: *Die Genesis Uebersetzt*, Freiburg i. B., 1888.

their ancestors. In Gen. xi. 28, also, Dillmann for this reason proposes to ascribe Ur Kasdîm to R. Kittel rejoins, — and again I must assent to his position, — that if lack of harmony with other statements of P does not prove Ur Kasdîm to be an interpolation in v. 31, neither can it, on similar grounds, be proved an interpolation in v. 28, although its presence here is not absolutely necessary to the sense. *Prima facie* it belongs in this verse to the original author, J, and there is no proof to the contrary. Thus we have both P and J mentioning Ur Kasdîm.

In regard to Gen. xv. 7, which Wellhausen and Dillmann regard as an editorial insertion, Kittel takes the ground that the arguments for this are not conclusive. One argument is the presence of Ur Kasdîm, but this has been already seen to be not necessarily from R. Another is the difficulty of connecting v. 7 with its context; but this difficulty exists only if we assume that vv. 7 sqq. (or 8 sqq.) were originally designed to be the direct continuation of vv. 1–6. This is, however, not the case. Vv. 1–6 are concerned with Abram's posterity, and he believes Jehovah's promise in this regard. Vv. 7 sqq. are concerned with the possession of the land, an entirely different subject. V. 6 is a sufficient and satisfactory ending to the first paragraph. Without holding that either paragraph is entirely homogeneous, Kittel regards the two as separate from each other, and combined by R. The matter is very difficult to decide, but I am not able to see any conclusive reason for rejecting J's authorship of v. 7. P, then, mentions Ur Kasdîm once, and J twice.

Kittel declines, however, to receive these references as valid evidence of the actual connection of Teraḥ and his family with Baby-lonia. The lack of any other mention of this point of departure, and the apparently conflicting tradition of P in xi. 10 sqq. lead him to the conclusion that either there is some other Ur Kasdîm than Uru-Muḳayyar, or P and J intended Uru-Muḳayyar, but were ignorant of its true location, — “so dass sie es irrtümlich in anderer Lage vorstellen, als ihm thatsächlich zukam” (Theol. Stud. aus Württ., 1886, p. 215). The former alternative cannot, so far as our present knowledge goes, form any longer a topic for serious discussion.¹ The only

¹ Kittel, indeed, argues for its possibility, but his argument lacks all cogency. What Schrader wrote on this point, ZDMG. xxvii. 1873, although some details must now be modified, has not yet been refuted. Note, in particular, that even if there were Chaldeans in Armenia (Kittel), which is not proven, this is no argument for a northeastern *Ur Kasdîm*, nor does it explain how a place of this name was found in the neighborhood of Ḥaran. See also SCHRADER, in RIEHM'S HdWB., Arts. *Chaldäer* and *Ur*.

Ur Kasdîm of which we have any knowledge is that at Mukayyar. It is in recognition of this that Dillmann (Genesis⁵) maintains that Ur Kasdîm is due to R, thus endeavoring to shun the conflict between Ur Kasdîm and other statements of P and J.

Leaving the possibility of another Ur quite out of the account, then, we have to consider whether the conflict within the documents themselves really exists, and, if so, whether there is really no other way of removing it than the second alternative proposed by Kittel, and whether, once more, if this alternative be unavoidable, its consequences are such as he affirms.

Besides the passages from P and J already named, there is a reference in Josh. xxiv. 2, 3 to the dwelling of the "fathers," including Teraḥ and Abraham, "beyond the river." This passage belongs to E, but is so brief and so indefinite in its geographical terms as to afford no ground for extended historical inferences. The most that can be said is that there is no evidence that E traced Abraham's family back of Mesopotamia (so Kittel).

Deut. xxvi. 5 calls the "father" of the Hebrews אֲרָמִי, "an Aramæan," an expression which, according to Kittel (who makes אֲבִי here collective), "drückt die Abstammung und Volksangehörigkeit der Väter unzweideutig aus" (Theol. Stud. aus Württ., 1886, p. 200). If so, this would be a startling divergence from P, which carefully distinguishes Aram from the ancestors of Abram (Gen. x. 22 sqq., xi. 10 sqq.). But the term may quite as well refer to locality, as to ethnic relationship, even if it includes Abraham; if, as is far more simple and probable, it refers merely to Jacob, the contrast being Jacob's solitariness and friendlessness, and the powerful Hebrew people (cf. Dillmann, *ad loc.*), then the passage does not bear on the question before us.¹

We are thus brought back to J and P, as the only documents to be considered.

The passages from J that concern us, are, as already indicated, in part, Gen. xi. 28-30; xii. 1-4^a; xv. 7(?); xxii. 20 sqq.; xxiv; xxvii. 43; xxviii. 10; xxix. 4 sqq. In none of these is there any reference to a family history lying back of the sojourn in Upper Mesopotamia, unless "Ur Kasdîm" contains such a reference. Nor is there anything in xi. 28 (nor xv. 7) to prove that Ur Kasdîm was not,

¹ Isaiah xli. 9 is cited by Kittel, *Geschichte*, p. 165 (cf. 155), as opposed to a Babylonian home of the Hebrews. But his remark upon it in his article in the *Theol. Stud. aus Württ.* (p. 188) is more judicious. He there calls it "zu unbestimmt als dass daraus etwas Wesentliches erschlossen werden könnte."

for J, either identical with "the city of Naḥor" = Ḥaran, or in the immediate vicinity (so Kittel). On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that Abraham's family history does not, in J, go back of Terah, his father, — more precisely, does not, in any detail, go back of the notices concerning Haran, Terah's son. That J originally had a table of Shem's descendants, corresponding to xi. 10 sqq. (P), is conjectured by Wellhausen (Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol., 1876, pp. 397 sq.), and Budde (pp. 306, 411, cf. Kittel) on too slender grounds (cf. Dillmann *ad loc.*). But even if we were to assume its previous existence, we could not now reconstruct it, nor make any affirmation about its geographical implications.¹ As the case stands, we find the silence of J as to a pre-Mesopotamian home for Abraham's family matched, and thus rendered less significant, by the absence of any knowledge at all about the life of that family prior to the death of Haran. Unquestionably, J is, for his purposes, concerned to emphasize the Mesopotamian residence of Abraham and his relatives. This appears, not in xi. 28–30, xii. 1–4^a, and xv. 7, but in xxiv., xxvii., xxviii., xxix. Even this, however, is not a geographical nor historical interest. It rests upon the contrast between his own relatives and the (corrupt) people of the land of Canaan, — in other words, a family (and religious) exclusiveness. Hence the careful statements about Naḥor's children, xxii. 20 sqq., (cf. xi. 29); hence the stress laid upon relationship, xxiv. 4, 7, etc. (מולדת, cf. xii. 1, מארצך וממולדתך); hence the reference to "the city of Naḥor,"² xxiv. 10, — a descriptive term, bringing out the characteristic of the city which turned Abraham's thought toward it. Thus if there were a single distinct reference in J to some earlier home of the Terachites, there is no other statement in J, as we now have him, that would necessarily conflict with such a reference, while J's object in dwelling on the Mesopotamian home is such as to explain why he did not give fuller information (if he had it) about the earlier home. Is there, then, any such distinct reference to an earlier home in "Ur Kasdîm"? Kittel replies that J locates Ur Kasdîm in the immediate neighborhood of the city of Naḥor = Ḥaran (see above). But if it was not really there, how did J come to suppose it was, or indeed to use the name at all?

¹ A sentence of Wellhausen's in regard to it is worth quoting: "Will man *Vermuthungen* über den Inhalt der jehovist. Genealogie aufstellen, so ist jedenfalls *sicher*, dass sie von Sem auf Eber Phaleg übergang und die zwei Glieder Arpaksad Selah nicht hatte"! (*Italics mine*).

² = Ḥaran? Cf. Gen. xxix. 4 sq. (Kittel).

Kittel answers this question by referring to *Kesed* (כֶּסֶד, a son of Naḥor), Gen. xxii. 22 (cf. Job i. 17), and adding :

“ Hatte er nun irgendwoher eine Kunde von jenem Ur, das wohl im Munde der hebräisch redenden Stämme Gileads den Beinamen Ur Kasdîm erhalten hatte — was lag ihm näher, als es eben wegen des Namens Kesed, und wegen der ihm anderweitig feststehenden Gewissheit der Herkunft Abrahams aus Charan und dessen Umgebung eben dort zu suchen? ” But surely the mere information that there was a city (or region) called Ur, further qualified by Kasdîm, the name of the people in whose territory it lay, would not have led J to make it the home of Abraham, even though the name of that people suggested that of one of Abraham’s nephews. How little this resemblance can prove appears from Budde’s remark (p. 440) that J’s acquaintance with the Kasdîm is indicated by his mention of Kesed, Naḥor’s son, and that we have no ground to think of any other Kasdîm as descendants of Naḥor, than those of Babylonia, who are likewise sufficient for Job i. 17. “ Mit äusseren Gründen, ” adds Budde, “ ist daher gegen Ur Kasdîm [*i.e.*, in Babylonia] als Bestandtheil der jahvistischen Ueberlieferung in keinem Punkte etwas auszurichten. ”

The internal grounds against Ur Kasdîm = Muḳayyar Budde meets by supposing that J originally named a mountain not far from Babylonia as the landing-place of the ark, and that Ur Kasdîm was, according to J’s flood-story, the first settlement of men after the flood (Budde, p. 442). But this device is objectionable because — to mention no other reason — the assumption of a conflict between P and J in the matter of the resting-place of the ark is too grave to be supported by such evidences as are adduced. The connection between the Babylonian flood-story and that of J, important as it is, is far too imperfectly understood to prop such an hypothesis.

Thus much, however, we can say : The mention of Ur Kasdîm by J is presumptive evidence that the materials with which he worked furnished him the name of this place in connection with the family of Abraham, and this evidence is the stronger, the less obviously this place was suggested by the rest of his narrative, because this shows that J must have had some strong reason for recording the name. If he had no definite view as to where it was, or if he supposed it to be in Upper Mesopotamia, where it was not, it is evident that he did not invent it, but set down the name as one transmitted to him along with the story of Abraham. If he knew where it was, but either did not know how to combine it with the traditions centring about Ḥaran, or felt no interest in giving details about the earlier life of Terah and

his sons, the meagreness of reference to it in Gen. xi. 28 would be explained, as well as the avoidance of it in those parts of the narrative which are obviously concerned with Upper Mesopotamia alone.

And this suggests a reference to those passages of his document which unmistakably deal with Babylonia, *viz.*, Gen. x. 8-12, xi. 1-9. A writer who could make Babylonia the centre of dispersion for the race, and could give information about early Babylonian cities and the great Babylonian hero, need not be presumed ignorant that the part of the race which to him was by far the most important began its specific migration in the same region.¹

The statements of P are at once more explicit and more difficult. Gen. xi. 31 leaves no doubt that Ur Kasdīm was distinct from Ḥaran, and at some distance from it; xii. 4^b, 5 makes Ḥaran the point of departure for Canaan; xxv. 20, it is true, does not intimate that Bethuel was related to Abraham; but to offset this, the genealogy of Abraham is given, xi. 10-26 (cf. x. 22, 31), in terms that are thought to preclude any Babylonian sojourn for his parents. Add to this that P makes the ark rest in Armenia, so that with him the postdiluvian race as well as the line of Shem spread by movement from the extreme north. As in the case of J, we must first try to determine the exact facts, and then consider their meaning.

It becomes evident at once that the fact of P's naming the mountains of Ararat as the resting-place of the ark does not determine the question as to the home of the Shemites or of Abraham's immediate family. Ham was a son of Noah, as well as Shem, and yet we find P setting Ham's children in Africa, without a hint as to how they got there (Gen. x. 6, 7). More than this, when it is said that the names of Shem's descendants (xi. 10 sqq.) can be traced geographically from north (or N. E.) to south (or S. W.), ending in Upper Mesopotamia, it might be replied that the order of Ham's sons is just the reverse ("Cush and Mizraim and Put and Canaan," Gen. x. 6), and that this presents a difficulty quite as real as Terah's starting from Babylonia. Or is it really any easier to conceive how Ham journeyed from Armenia to Ethiopia before he had any sons, and how his family

¹ Budde and others postulate a J¹ for xi. 1-9, and give the flood and the Ur Kasdīm to J². But this does not particularly affect the point just now under discussion. Budde makes J¹ bring Noah and his sons from Babel after the dispersion, and makes J²'s flood end within reach of Ur Kasdīm. This is a tissue of hypotheses, but even on these assumptions both J¹ and J² were at least familiar with Babylonia.

then migrated northward again, than to conceive of Naḥor (the elder)¹ or Terah, if no earlier progenitor of Abraham, as moving southward into Babylonia, and then taking a new start northward?

When we look closely at the genealogy of xi. 10 sqq. we find that the geographical identifications are of very unequal merit. Of the nine names from Shem to Terah inclusive, only three can be seriously considered, from this point of view. Shem, Shelah, Eber, Reu, Naḥor,² and Terah must be left out of the account. The other three are Arpachshad, Peleg, and Serug. Kittel insists on the identification of Arpachshad with the Ἀρπαχχίτης of Ptol. vi. 1, 2, which Dillmann treats with more caution. Without the last syllable, שך, this would be plausible; with the syllable the identification is difficult, especially since the Assyrian form of Arrapachitis is *Arrapha* (𐎠𐎼𐎶, not 𐎠𐎼𐎶), cf. Friedr. Delitzsch. WLP. pp. 124 sqq.

Peleg has been variously identified. The only identification that can be called attractive is that with *Phalga*, or *Phaliga*, at the junction of the Chaboras and Euphrates (cf. Dillm. on Gen. xi. 17). But this is far to the south (southeast) of Haran, and would raise a problem similar in kind, if not degree, to that which a Babylonian Ur Kasdîm offers to Kittel.

We have left only Serug, which the weight of opinion inclines to identify with the *Sarug* put by Arabic and Syriac writers a little northward from Haran.³ That is to say, we have one plausible identification dependent on mediæval geographers, set over against one equally good from a phonetic point of view, and supported by far more ancient testimony. All the possibilities of a migration of names, as well as of tribes,⁴ are in force in the case of Serug, but non-existent in the case of Ur Kasdîm.

From these considerations it appears to me not perfectly obvious that P in his genealogy of Shem's descendants intends to represent the ancestors of the Hebrews as descending in one steady migration from the mountains of Armenia to the region about Haran.

But even if he does intend this, there still remains in P's case, as

¹ Whose name is questioned by Wellhausen, Kittel, and others, but with no good reason.

² J's mention of Naḥor's children, xxii. 22 sqq., and of the "city of Naḥor," xxiv. 10, does not affect this point. On "Chesed," cf. Budde, above.

³ Cf. DILLMANN, *ad loc.*

⁴ Cf. PEISER. Mitteilungen d. Akademisch-Orientalischen Vereins zu Berlin, 1887, p. 3. See also, on this matter, G. RAWLINSON, in Smith's Bible Dictionary, Art. *Ur*.

in that of J, serious difficulty. P makes Teraḥ and his family start from Ur Kasdîm. The only Ur Kasdîm we know is that at El-Muḳayyar. If these statements conflict, which is right? How do we know that P was following more trustworthy authorities when he traced the Hebrews down from Armenia, or from the mountains of the upper Zab (Arrapachitis), — granting that he did so, — than when he brought them up out of lower Babylonia? Or if P reconciled his statements in his own mind, how did he do it? Was he, as Kittel thinks, ignorant of the true position of Ur Kasdîm? This seems very unlikely, as in the case of J, in view of the importance, antiquity and long-continued fame of Ur-Muḳayyar, in the land of the Chaldeans. But, allowing that he was ignorant, — that he supposed Ur Kasdîm to be somewhere to the north or northeast of Ḥaran, where there really was no such place, — how came he to mention it at all? We find here, on the hypothesis, a name out of all geographical connection with the other geographical notices in P. Why do we find it? Must it not be that P was constrained by information which he felt bound to trust, to connect Ur Kasdîm with Abraham's family, whether or not he knew where it was?

In short, the appearance of Ur Kasdîm in these narratives of Genesis¹ demands explanation, and the only explanation that explains is the one which admits the presence of it among the historical materials on which these narratives are based.

It has thus been attempted to show that the grounds for supposing a conflict between a Babylonian home for the early Hebrews, and the other geographical statements of the Genesis-narratives are not so formidable as has sometimes been thought, and that such a conflict, even if it, to any degree, exists, by no means destroys the arguments in favor of Ur Kasdîm = Uru Muḳayyar.

Here the matter might be for the present left. I add, however, a few remarks with reference, not to the attitude of the documents alone, but to the argument, as a whole, in favor of the Babylonian starting point of the Hebrew migration.

In his article in the *Theol. Stud. aus Württ.*, Kittel was especially careful to say that he was dealing with only one line of proof, that from the historical and geographical indications of Genesis. In his History, however (pp. 163-sqq.), he apparently regards this as the whole case. It is a striking weakness in a most admirable book that

¹ A similar line of argument would be in place if Ur Kasdîm be an insertion of R (Dillm.), only that R must certainly have known where it really lay.

he here leaves wholly out of the account those indications of historic connection between the Babylonians and the Hebrews, which have been above briefly touched upon, and also like indications of early community of ideas between Babylonia and Ḥaran,¹ and makes the question as to historic fact depend upon the knowledge of the authors in regard to the location of Ur Kasdîm. The question as to whether the Hebrews actually came out from Babylonia (not whether P or J did or did not understand it so), calls for much wider investigation, and involves other factors. Especially is it desirable, however, that the question be understood for just what it is. It is not identical with that as to the centre of dispersion of the postdiluvian race, nor with that as to the migrations of the Shemitic family; nor is it dependent on the answers to these. The movements of tribes and nations may be eddies, or back currents, in the greater migrations. We cannot, as already pointed out, reconcile the genealogy of Ham's descendants, given by P, with the resting of the ark in Armenia (also P), without taking this into the account. Nor, to give a parallel somewhat closer, can we accept the Egyptian sojourn and exodus of the Hebrews without acknowledging the possibility of a Babylonian sojourn at an early period of their history, even if the exodus from Babylonia were proved to have landed them where they had lived before.² It is quite as easy to suppose that a Shemitic movement from the north, leaving traces of itself along the way, passed down to Lower Babylonia, and then sent a stream back, as that such a movement passed from Mesopotamia through Palestine to Egypt and back again to Palestine, and neither is at all incredible. The only essential difference between the two cases would be that we have a narrative of the journey to Egypt, but none of the journey to Babylonia. But this is not surprising. We have no diary of the movements of ancient peoples, and the farther back we trace them, the scantier are the notices we find concerning them. If there are good grounds for believing that a given tribe was once at a given place, it is no objection to an acceptance of the fact that we are not informed exactly how it came there.

¹ Cf. SCHRADER: *Die Keilinschriften u. die Geschichtsforschung*, Giessen, 1878, pp. 355, 536.

² If the Shemite migration originally came from the north, we have another kindred fact in the movement of power northward from Babylonia to Assyria; cf. Gen. x. 11.